

Discussion of Transition Plan for the New Accreditation System October 2015

Overview

This agenda item provides the COA with an opportunity to discuss the implementation of the transition plan for moving all 253 Commission approved institutions to the new accreditation system by 2017-18.

Staff Recommendation

For discussion only.

Background

On August 27, 2015, the Commission took action to approve a proposed plan to move all Commission approved institutions to the new accreditation system by 2017-18. This transition plan took into consideration the time and work necessary prior to full implementation of the system. Among the many tasks, this work includes the adoption of new standards for preliminary Multiple and Single Subject teaching and for induction programs as well as revised Teaching Performance Expectations; the development of new performance assessments for teaching and administration; the development of a data warehouse and data dashboards; the development of new processes and procedures for accreditation; the adoption of a new Accreditation Framework and a new Accreditation Handbook. In addition, consideration of specific accreditation activities for the 7 cohorts over the next two years was critical to ensure common expectations.

The August 2015 Commission agenda item is included in the appendix to this item. Commission staff will review the plan with the COA and discuss implications for the work of streamlining and strengthening the accreditation system.

3D

Action

Educator Preparation Committee

Proposed Plan to Transition to the Revised Accreditation System

Executive Summary: This agenda item proposes a means to transition all Commission approved programs to the revised accreditation system.

Policy Question: Does the proposed plan for transitioning all Commission approved programs to the revised accreditation system meet the Commission's expectations?

Recommended Action: That the Commission discuss and approve the proposed plan for transitioning all Commission approved programs to the new accreditation system.

Presenters: Cheryl Hickey and Catherine Kearney, Administrators, Professional Services Division

Strategic Plan Goal

II. Program Quality and Accountability

- a) Develop and maintain rigorous, meaningful, and relevant standards that drive program quality and effectiveness for the preparation of the education workforce and are responsive to the needs of California's diverse student population.

August 2015

Proposed Plan to Transition to the Revised Accreditation System

Introduction

This agenda item presents a plan for Commission consideration to transition all Commission approved institutions and the programs they offer to the revised accreditation system as expeditiously and as efficiently as possible.

Background

Currently, the Commission accredits 253 institutions to offer educator preparation programs in California. These include 23 California State Universities, 8 University of California campuses, 55 independent institutions, and 167 local education agencies. The current accreditation process is comprised of a 7 year cycle of activities, with each of the 253 institutions placed into one of the 7 years of the cycle. Although all the details of each component of the new accreditation system are not yet finalized and much work still needs to be done to ensure its effective development and implementation, institution and program leadership have begun inquiring about expectations moving forward as they relate specifically to their own institution.

While staff continues to finalize the details related to the various components of the revised accreditation system and continues to present items before the Commission to bring to fruition the Commission's vision for the new system, staff has also been working to develop a plan to transition these 253 institutions to the new system as quickly, efficiently and effectively as possible. In developing the plan detailed in this item, consideration was given to work that must be accomplished by the institutions as well as by the Commission staff in order for the new system to be successful. The proposed plan will allow staff to provide significant technical assistance to institutions and provide institutions with adequate time and support to fully transition to the new system.

Revise the Accreditation Cycle

Previous agenda items, including item 4C from this meeting, have identified some of the major activities proposed in the new accreditation system and for that reason, will not be repeated here. Agenda item 5C from the June 2015 Commission meeting (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2015-06/2015-06-5C.pdf>) provides more information on the proposed activities in the revised system.

In beginning to develop a plan for transition, the Commission staff considered several important efforts currently underway by the Commission. Revised Common, Preliminary, and Induction standards, as well as revised Teaching Performance Expectations are still being finalized and have not yet been adopted by the Commission. Once revised standards are adopted, institutions will need time to review and revise their programs to remain aligned with the revised standards and the Accreditation Framework must still be updated. Further, Commission staff considered the important role that data will play in the new system and the

anticipated launch date for the new data warehouse. In addition, new performance assessments will be developed and are expected to be ready for implementation in 2017-18. With the work that needs to be done, it seems appropriate that 2017-18 will be the year when the revised accreditation system will be ready to be fully implemented. Rather than move various institutions or cohorts over to the new system in succession over a period of years, staff proposes that there be a concentrated focus on moving all institutions into the new system by 2017-18 with all aspects of the new system being implemented by that time. With that understanding, the Commission staff identified the numerous accreditation activities that will need to take place to ensure that all institutions are on line with the new system in 2017-18.

Under the proposed plan, 2015-16 and 2016-17 would be program development and transition years. To a large measure, the 2015-16 year maintains the current accreditation system as new policies and procedures are approved, the *Accreditation Framework* is revised and adopted by the Commission, the revised TPEs and Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject program standards are adopted, and information is shared with program sponsors. In this year, the biennial report requirements and site visit requirements will remain unchanged. Program assessment documents that are already submitted (Green cohort) are being reviewed. Site Visits for the Blue cohort are taking place during 2015-16. In addition to these ongoing activities, as revised standards are approved, institutions would begin to make revisions to their current programs to align with the revised standards.

Under the proposed plan, the 2016-17 year would focus heavily on providing technical assistance to the field and ensuring that all programs are brought in line with the new accreditation system. Working with institutions to ensure that programs are revised in alignment with new program and Common Standards and that issues around outcomes data expectations are clear would be critical during this period. Clarifying aspects of the new *Accreditation Framework* and focusing on all aspects to support the new accreditation system are also important. As part of the transition, it is important that programs become familiar with reviewing and analyzing survey data, therefore in 2016-17 in lieu of Biennial Reports, staff propose work with programs to become familiar with available survey data. Site visits could still take place for any institution that the COA has determined should be reviewed. These would take place if there are any indications that the institution and/or its programs are not complying with Commission standards. Additionally, because the new system would require that preconditions be submitted twice in the cycle, four cohorts would submit responses and supporting documentation addressing the Commission's Precondition responses over the two-year transition period (2015-16 and 2016-17).

These preliminary activities along with significant technical assistance from Commission staff will provide an effective and expedient method of moving all institutions fully to the new system at the same time in 2017-18.

Two tables follow that illustrate the proposed transition plan. Table 1 provides information on the activities that will need to take place in order to bring all institutions into alignment with the new system in 2017-18.

Table 1: Program Development and Transition Accreditation Activities Planned for 2015-16 and 2016-17

Program Sponsors	When	Commission Staff
<p>Accreditation Activities Continue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Site visits for Blue Cohort – Program Assessment revisions for Green Cohort – Submit biennial reports – Blue and Orange Cohorts – Initial Program Review Continues <p>Participate in Initial Training and Technical Assistance</p> <p>Continue to Collect and Analyze Candidate Competency Data</p> <p>Work with faculty and staff to understand the revised accreditation system</p> <p>Revise MS/SS Programs to meet updated standards</p> <p>Revise Induction Programs to meet updated standards</p> <p>Prepare Course Matrices for Program Document Review</p> <p>Review and revise Common Standards response</p> <p>Review and Update Preconditions</p> <p>Adjust Data Systems to Align with Data Warehouse Protocols</p> <p>Identify and Train “Submitters”</p> <p>Establish Internal Unit and Program Expectations</p> <p>Participate in Revised BIR Training</p> <p>Provide Participants for Document and SV Review Teams (Green)</p> <p>Engage Stakeholders in Transition to New System</p> <p>Review Institutional Survey Data; Submit Analysis and Response to CTC (2016-17 only as part of transition)</p> <p>Year-Out Site Visit Preparation for Green Cohort</p>	<p>Fall 2015</p> <p>Spring 2017</p>	<p>Staff Blue Site Visits</p> <p>Review and Provide Feedback to Orange and Blue Biennial Reports</p> <p>Staff Indigo Cohort Revisits; Monitor 7th Year Reports; Review New Programs</p> <p>Staff work to implement the revised Accreditation Framework</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Revise & Disseminate Accreditation Handbooks (via technology) – Update Site Visit Templates – Update Data Analysis Feedback forms – Update Document Review (PA) Feedback – Internal Training-Consultants, AGPAs – Develop and Implement Accreditation Activity Monitoring – Revisit Accreditation Fee Structure <p>Provide Technical Assistance in Person and via Technology. Hold regional meetings to provide targeted technical assistance for specific types of educator preparation programs and for education units.</p> <p>Update Accreditation Website—extensive</p> <p>Produce and Disseminate PSAs as Needed for Transition</p> <p>Review Precondition Responses</p> <p>Retool BIR Training</p> <p>Develop/Implement Data Protocols for Warehouse</p> <p>Provide Technical Assistance on the revised accreditation system</p> <p>Recruit new members of the BIR and retrain all BIR members for the revised system</p> <p>Assign Two sets of Institutional Review Teams:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Site Visit Team for Green cohort – Document Review (CS and PA) for Yellow cohort (subset of team will participate in SV) <p>Review Survey Data Submissions</p> <p>Year-Out Site Visit Preparation for Green Cohort</p>

Table 2 below illustrates, in very broad terms, the activities that will take place over the next two years (shaded cells), and then the full implementation of the new accreditation cycle beginning in 2017-18. The numbers at the top of each cell denote the accreditation year of the cohort.

Table 2: Accreditation Submissions due to the Commission							
	Blue	Green	Yellow	Orange	Red	Violet	Indigo
2015-16	6 Site Visit Biennial Report Preconditions (PA is in)	5 Preconditions	4 Preconditions (spring 2016)	3 Biennial Report	2	1 Preconditions (spring 2016)	7 Year 7 Follow- Up
2016-17	Year 7 Follow- Up Respond to Survey Data	Data Analysis Document Review: CS (PA is in) Respond to Survey Data	Respond to Survey Data	Respond to Survey Data	Respond to Survey Data	Respond to Survey Data	Respond to Survey Data
2017-18	7 Data Analysis	6 Data Analysis Site Visit	5 Data Analysis Document Review: CS and PA	4 Data Analysis Preconditions	3 Data Analysis	2 Data Analysis	1 Data Analysis Preconditions
2018-19	1 Data Analysis Preconditions	7 Year 7 Follow- Up	6 Data Analysis Site Visit	5 Data Analysis Document Review: CS and PA	4 Data Analysis Preconditions	3 Data Analysis	2 Data Analysis
2019-20	2 Data Analysis	1 Data Analysis Preconditions	7 Year 7 Follow- Up	6 Data Analysis Site Visit	5 Data Analysis Document Review: CS and PA	4 Data Analysis Preconditions	3 Data Analysis
2020-21	3 Data Analysis	2 Data Analysis	1 Data Analysis Preconditions	7 Year 7 Follow- Up	6 Data Analysis Site Visit	5 Data Analysis Document Review: CS and PA	4 Data Analysis Preconditions
2021-22	4 Data Analysis Preconditions	3 Data Analysis	2 Data Analysis	1 Data Analysis Preconditions	7 Year 7 Follow- Up	6 Data Analysis Site Visit	5 Data Analysis Document Review: CS and PA
2022-23	5 Data Analysis	4 Data Analysis Preconditions	3 Data Analysis	2 Data Analysis	1 Data Analysis Preconditions	7 Year 7 Follow- Up	6 Data Analysis Site Visit

Impact on Annual Accreditation Fees

Accreditation Fees are collected annually to support the activities of the entire seven year cycle of accreditation. Under this proposed plan, although the addition of a transition/development year during 2016-17 extends the current cycle temporarily to eight years, the annual accreditation fees would remain the same for 2016-17. While under the proposed plan to transition to the new accreditation system regularly scheduled site visits would not take place during the 2016-17 academic year; extensive technical assistance, data submission and analysis, and program revision and development would take place in 2016-17. Technical assistance would occur through a variety of methods including in-person contact.

Because there are still significant decisions that the Commission needs to make with respect to the various aspects of the new accreditation system over the course of the next few Commission meetings, the implications of some of these decisions on the overall cost of the system is yet to be determined. Staff proposes to review the annual fee structure in light of the new accreditation system and bring an item to the Commission in February 2016, which will allow the Commission to decide if modifications to the fee structure are warranted.

Staff Recommendation

The staff recommends that the Commission approve the plan to transition all Commission approved programs to the new accreditation system including that no regularly scheduled accreditation site visits will be scheduled for the 2016-17 year and that annual accreditation fees will be collected in 2016-17.

Next Steps

If the Commission approves the transition plan to bring all institutions into alignment with the new accreditation system in 2017-18, staff will communicate this plan to the field as it continues working to implement all aspects of a new accreditation system. Staff plans to bring an agenda item on the Annual Accreditation Fees in February 2016 so the Commission can consider the impact of the revised accreditation system on the Annual Accreditation Fee structure.